

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/770,206 01/29/2001		01/29/2001	Rochester Tiao-Te Co	P 276721 PE-19624-AM	6857
909	7590	04/23/2004		EXAMINER	
		THROP, LLP	LUDLOW, JAN M		
P.O. BOX 10500 MCLEAN, VA 22102				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,				1743	-
				DATE MAILED: 04/23/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			4/
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/770,206	CO, ROCHESTER TIAO-TE	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jan M. Ludlow	1743	
The MAILING DATE of this communical Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) da - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuto - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a recation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty by period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT by statute, cause the application to become ABA	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on	•	
	☑ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice		•	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☑ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the appleada) Of the above claim(s) is/are versions. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 1.11-14 and 23-25 is/are rejections. 7) ☑ Claim(s) 2-10 and 15-22 is/are objected. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restrictions.	withdrawn from consideration. sted. d to.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2001	$\underline{1}$ is/are: a) \boxtimes accepted or b) \square ob	jected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection		` ,	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents.	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in Ap he priority documents have been r Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	plication No eceived in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Su	mmary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date		/Mail Date´. ormal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Application/Control Number: 09/770,206

Art Unit: 1743

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 4. Claims 1, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by St. Amand (4779768).
- St. Amand teaches a pipette having a tube 14, 38, 56 with open bottom end 20, 40, 62 and closed top end adjacent side opening at conduit 30, 50, 66 of a closed shell having a top end at the top of compressible bulb 28, 48, 70 and bottom end at the bottom of reservoir 22, 24, 44, 64. The shell is *connected* sideways to the tube via an opening at the mouth of conduit 30, 50, 66. The shell is entirely sidewise in the

Application/Control Number: 09/770,206

Art Unit: 1743

embodiment shown in Figures 8 and 9. The length and diameter of the tube define the volume dispensed (col. 1, lines 47-50).

- 5. Claims 11-14, 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over St. Amand as applied to claims above.
 - St. Amand fails to specify the dimensions of the pipette.

It would have been obvious to make the tube of St. Amand of the claimed dimensions in order to deliver quantities of fluid typically used in laboratory analysis because St. Amand teaches that the length and diameter of the tube are result dependent variables for determining the volume aspirated and dispensed. With respect to claims 23-24, it would have been obvious to make the wall thickness as claimed in order to provide structural strength and permit compression in order to make the device function as taught by St. Amand.

- 6. Claims 2-10, 15-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

It would not have been obvious to make the peripheral wall of the shell of St. Amand as claimed to produce a substantially rectangular shell because St. Armand teaches that the convoluted flow path defined by the wall shape is important in the function of the invention.

Art Unit: 1743

Foldenauer teaches a pipette with a first tube having a closed top (e.g., 18) and a closed shell (e.g., 20), but the opening connecting the two is not seen as being adjacent the closed end of the tube as instantly claimed. It would not have been obvious to move the opening because the closed end of the tube 18 is used as a bulb to dispense the fluid.

Rodrigues teaches an additional form of pipette with an overflow chamber, but does not teach or suggest, e.g., a closed ended tube with a peripheral wall opening.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jan M. Ludlow whose telephone number is (571) 272-1260. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 11:30 am - 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill A. Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jan M. Ludlow Primary Examiner Art Unit 1743

an Miller

Jml April 17, 2004